DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 063 958 LI 003 714

AUTHOR Holley, Edward G.
TITLE American University Libraries; Organization and Administration.
INSTITUTION Texas A & M Univ., College Station. Library
REPORT NO Misc-Pub-3
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 17p.; (20 References)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Administration; Librarians; *Organization; *Staff Role; Unions; *University Libraries

ABSTRACT

At the beginning of the 1970s, American university libraries can look back upon a decade of phenomenal growth. Serious problems of organization and administration often resulted from this growth which have not received the attention deserved. The traditional hierarchial structure of university libraries with one head librarian at the top is no longer sufficient. Many librarians have recognized the need for a look at how libraries are organized and managed. Much of the investigation centers around three main points: (1) the need for greater staff involvement in library decision-making, (2) the need for some form of academic governance for professional staffs, and (3) the prospective unionization of library staffs. Whether through faculty governance, greater staff involvement on committees or other structures, or through unionization, the stress is upon staff involvement in library decisions. (Author/SJ)

ED 063958

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Organization and Administration

Texas A&M University Library
College Station, Texas
1971

LI 003 714

Introduction

This paper, which discusses problems and developments in American university library administration, was delivered by Dr. Edward G. Holley on October 15 as the first lecture in the 1971-72 Texas A&M University Library Lecture Series. The paper resulted from extensive investigations conducted by Dr. Holley, mainly in the spring of 1971, in connection with his Council on Library Resources Fellowship. We of the Texas A&M University Library are grateful to the author for allowing us the privilege of publishing his work which surely will be of interest to many academic librarians.

At this particular time, we in Texas libraries are faced with the sad prospect of losing Ed Holley to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, where he goes on January 1 to become Dean of the graduate library school. For these past nine years, Ed has been colleague, friend and mentor to Texas librarians. He has worked diligently and effectively for the good of libraries and the library profession in our state. He leaves Texas with our best wishes and our gratitude. He will be sorely missed.

John B. Smith
Director of Libraries

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Organization and Administration

Edward G. Holley

At the beginning of the nineteen-seventies, American university libraries can look back upon a decade of phenomenal growth. Their volume count, long a traditional measure of library excellence, grew from 201,423,000 in 1961/62 to an estimated 350,000,000 in 1970/71, while at the same time total personnel, both clerical and professional, increased from 21,100 to 48,000 and total annual operating expenses advanced from $183,700,000 to an estimated $600,000,000.[1] Even more impressive was the sharp increase in expenditures for library materials, a hefty 370 percent, accounted for partly by inflation and partly by federal funding under Title II-A of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Despite these apparently substantial gains, student enrollment, which grew from 3.9 million to 8.2 million, actually caused a decline in the number of volumes per student from 51.6 in 1961/62 to 42.7 in 1970/71.[2] No doubt much of this decline occurred because of the number of libraries in new institutions (some 600) but some of it was also accounted for by the expansion of enrollments in large universities, chiefly urban, where library resources have been traditionally less than satisfactory.[3] When added to the pressures from new graduate programs, the increasing power of accreditation agencies in many subject disciplines, the emergence of higher education boards in forty-six of the fifty states, and the general unrest both on the campus and in society as a whole, this massive growth presented serious problems of organization and administration for many universities. Tensions grew among the students-faculty-administration-librarians. Thus, what one might have recorded as a decade of progress, in retrospect was sometimes obscured by the frustration of library administrators dealing with everyday problems over much too long a period of time.

At the end of the sixties it has not been uncommon for chief librarians, who by any objective standards served their institutions well, to retire early from their directorships, some with sorrow, some with relief, and a few with bitterness. Very few have retired with the glory and honor that used to accompany extraordinary acomplishments in building resources and expanding services. After years of important contributions they deserve better of their associates. One cannot help

feeling a sense of regret that their staffs, so concerned with being treated humanly and humanely by chief librarians, do not show similar characteristics in return.

Even without consideration of the newer technologies, including microforms, computers, micro-wave links, etc., or the change in the book market itself with the advent of reprints galore and canned processing, a library staff which has grown from 30 to 100, as many smaller universities have, or from 150 to three or four hundred, as is true in many of the larger universities, presents any administrator with a fundamental change in the way his library system can be administered. Organizational problems become more complex, supervision more difficult, human relations problems less susceptible of quick resolution, and communications among staff formidable indeed. No longer is it possible for every staff member to see top management every day and often it is much more difficult for each individual to see how his role fits into overall library objectives or how he plays his part in achieving library goals.

Under the circumstances, where the growth of collections and the expansion of units of service were the main characteristics of the decade, perhaps it is not surprising that library literature, like the literature of higher education as a whole, showed more attention to the problems of financing, building collections, processing books, securing personnel, than it did to administration or to new forms of organization. Thus library organization became in some cases a patchwork quilt without any rethinking of the basic structure. There was simply more of everything: more assistant directors, more department heads, more specialists, and more beginning librarians. As the Booz, Allen & Hamilton study, *Problems in University Library Management,* notes, "Existing Plans of Organization of University Libraries Appear Often to Be the Consequence of Gradual Development Rather Than the Result of Analysis of Requirements and Consideration of Alternatives."[4] Few would deny this assertion. University libraries, like their parent institutions, came late to long-range planning.

Before examining what has emerged in the way of new organizational structures, or rather what appears to be emerging, perhaps we would do well to remind ourselves of the typical library administrative structure as it has been found in American colleges and universities.

Traditionally, academic libraries were highly centralized with a head librarian at the top, and four to six department heads all reporting directly to him. These departments usually reflected such basic library operations as acquisitions, cataloging, circulation, and reference, with other departments added as the university library system expanded. Many library departments were quite small. When *College and Research Libraries* published its first annual statistics for 1941-42, the median number of full-time personnel in the largest college and university

libraries was 37.[5] Thanks to the return of World War II veterans to the campus and the economic expansion in the late forties, the median number of FTE library staffs rose to 51.5 in 1948/49.[6] Thus it is not surprising that simple departmentalization served many academic libraries well. The prevalence of this kind of organization today among universities with a small staff and small enrollments indicates its basic serviceability.

In the traditional departmentally organized library, the chief librarian often operated in a paternalistic, though not autocratic, style, and his library tended very much to bear the stamp of his own personality. Some of his modern detractors view him as an authoritarian, but this did not necessarily follow. Staff input was often greater than assumed, whether it took place in the weekly meeting of department heads or informally in conversation with everyone from the janitor to the associate librarian, if there was one. Consultation with the staff, meetings with the catalog department for example, often occurred daily and the chief librarian could keep his wary eye on all aspects of the library's operations. Few chiefs made decisions without consultation with their staffs, though this was often done without a good deal of fuss or fanfare. Certainly there was much less structure. The chief librarian was more concerned with his representation of library interests to his administrative superiors than he was with the internal structure and much was written about the place of the library in the total university community.[7] Generally, this meant the place of the chief librarian in the university hierarchy.

The growth and development of libraries after World War II made this pattern obsolete for most larger universities. No longer could the chief librarian see everyone, every day. He had obligations both on campus and off which precluded his direct involvement in daily operational problems. More assistants didn't really solve the problem, so there emerged during the forties the so-called bifurcated functional organization in which all library activities were divided either into readers' services or technical services. Arthur McAnally, in his article on "Organization of College and University Libraries," in the first issue of *Library Trends* could remark with some justification that "by 1952, however, one particular plan [*i.e.*, the bifurcated] for divisional organization has been widely accepted in large libraries."[8] Typically, two associate or assistant directors, one for public services, and one for technical services, were added between the director of libraries and the department heads. The public services chief assumed daily operational responsibility for all reference and circulation services, whether this took place in a central building or in departmental/college libraries. In terms of the administrative principle of no more than ten people reporting to any one individual, his responsibility in some places was much too extensive, and as many as thirty or forty people, in theory at least, reported directly to the assistant director for public services.

Technical services were much less extensive, but probably required even more coordination because of the increase in size of collections and yearly rate of acquisitions. To the acquisitions and catalog departments were sometimes added a serials department plus a few auxiliary units such as binding, catalog card production, and gifts and exchange.

The bifurcated system, with some modifications, still remains the basic operational pattern for most large university library systems. Occasionally other assistant directors have been added for administrative services, personnel, development of the collections, systems development, or departmental libraries. Most of these assistant directors operate within well-defined areas. Operational authority and responsibilty remain largely with the public and technical services administrators, who, after all, control most of the budget. In cases where there are medical and/or law schools and where these come under the budgetary control of the director of libraries, their librarians tend to operate in fact, if not in theory, on a par with assistant directors when it comes to policy making. Their library operations are often more influenced by the dean of their respective schools than they are by directors of libraries. This can be illustrated by an answer to my question at one major university, "How do you handle the law library?" The response was, "Very carefully."

These two plans, with some variation, still provide the basic organizational form for most American university libraries. They are hierarchial plans, built upon the earlier management principles of line authority stemming from the top. Lines of authority and responsibility are clearly marked out, and the pyramid form is probably their best graphic representation. They are not as lacking in staff involvement as is frequently assumed. Councils, committees, advisory boards, etc., usually have come into existence especially in the public services area, to enable staff to have input to administrative decisions. Meetings of the total staff occur less frequently as the staff grows in size. This can be a source of tension for some staff members who remember the delightful informality of earlier days.

The institution of academic planning on many campuses, the encouragement of more precise definitions of objectives and goals by higher education boards, and the prospect of a levelling off of support in the seventies, has suggested to many librarians the need for a new look at the way libraries are organized and managed. Discussions began in 1968 between the Association of Research Libraries and the Council on Library Resources concerning the need for an investigation of university library management problems.[9] In 1969 ARL and the American Council on Education created a joint Committee on University Library Management. With funding from the Council on Library Resources, Booz, Allen and Hamilton, a management consulting firm, studied the overall problems and produced a little booklet in 1970 called *Problems*

in University Library Management. Upon the conclusion of the first place of the ARL management study, Columbia University Libraries decided to undertake a comprehensive review of library management and at the same time serve as a case study of various forms of university library organization and patterns of staffing.[10] The same team of consultants, Booz, Allen and Hamilton, focused on alternate plans of organization and identification of total staff capabilities in an attempt to see if new ways could be devised to maximize the effect of talent and resources of the libraries on the educational programs of the university. This study, which will be mentioned later, began late in 1970 and should be completed by the winter of 1971.

Little of this ARL effort was familiar to me when, at about the same time, the Universtiy of Houston became involved in a serious way in looking at its academic planning. Among the UH staff we had discussed at great length future needs, resources, and organizational patterns. When I was asked to apply for a Council on Library Resources Fellowship, nothing seemed more appropriate than a look at urban university library organization and administration. The U. of H. libraries had made substantial progress during the decade, and all of the pressures mentioned earlier had, in one way or another, been a part of the Houston scene. The opportunity to take a semester off and have a look at how libraries were actually operating was a stimulating prospect. After all, the literature was sparse. Was anything actually going on from which I could learn? Had the newer developments actually influenced library management or were we merely patching up the old bifurcated plan? Since at that point I intended to stay at the University of Houston, I deliberately chose to look primarily at publicly supported urban universities. As matters turned out, I had a good opportunity to look at non-urban universities, too, during the spring of 1971. Though public universities were my main interest, I did not ignore such major private universities as Columbia, Southern California, New York University, University of Chicago, or Emory. Appendix A provides a list of universities visited.

By way of defense let me observe that public urban universities are different from other kinds of universities.[11] Theirs is largely a commuting student body, they serve a large part-time enrollment, students tend to seek solutions to their library problems closer to home, they have the resources of the city upon which to draw, and they share the increasing problems of the big city, violence, deteriorating neighborhoods, breakdown of transportation, etc. Earlier studies indicate that most of them are relatively poor in library resources and they largely remain so today.[12] Except for a few isolated examples like UCLA and the University of Minnesota they do not rank among the top thirty or forty universities in the country.

In view of these differences one might expect that urban university libraries would be differently organized. They are not. While they

vary greatly as universities, *e.g.*, the University of Southern California and the University of Chicago, or the University of California at Los Angeles and the University of Illinois at Chicago, their organizational patterns tend to be either the traditional centralized departmental organization or the bifurcated plan. There is little evidence that I could find that urban university libraries have planned seriously with the urban situation in mind. For the most part they are like other American academic libraries but are merely located in large cities. In terms of departmentalization they tend to have fewer branch libraries than other types of universities though there are obvious exceptions.

If urban university libraries have similar organizational patterns to other academic libraries, are there any other patterns either in embryo or emerging, that may provide alternate plans for the future? That is a much more difficult question to answer, though there is more study, talk, discussion, and planning going on among university library staffs than outsiders might expect to find. The idea that every member of society has a right to participate in decisions which immediatelv affect him has had a decided impact upon some academic librarians. There are study groups, councils, ad hoc committees, and professional staff meetings busily engaged in studying participatory management in many academic libraries. Yet at this point no one can point to any specific institution and say that its pattern will become the new organizational model for all university libraries. Academic librarianship is still groping for solutions; it has not yet found them.

However, much of the investigation does seem to revolve around three main points: the need for greater staff involvement in library decision-making (participative management), the need for some form of academic governance for professional staffs, and the prospective unionization of library staffs. To quote the ARL study again:

> Librarians are confronted with the need to make organization responsive to trends which stress the greater flow of communications among staff and the greater involvement of professional staff in decision-making. This is an outgrowth of the previously cited strengthening of employee organizations within the library and the increased number of higher level professionals which libraries have added to serve the specialized and sophisticated research and teaching needs of the faculty and student body.[13]

In a recent issue of *Library Trends,* two articles, one by Lawrence A. Allen and Barbara Conroy on "Social Interaction Skills" and the other by Maurice P. Marchant on "Participative Management as Related to Personnel Development," stress the present trend toward more participation by the library staff in decision-making as well as the need for developing more social interaction skills among the staffs so that libraries can become more effective social institutions. In some ways, these articles seem more hortatory than factual, but my trips around the country

this spring do indicate a decided interest among some library staffs in greater participation in library policy making.

Not surprisingly in view of the library's existence within the groves of academe, the most widespread interest is in some form of faculty governance. At the ALA conference in Dallas, members of the Association of College and Research Libraries approved tentative standards on faculty status.[16] Included in those standards is a clause which mandates an academic form of governance for libraries. Paragraph 2, "Library Governance," reads as follows:

> 2. *Library Governance.* College and university libraries should adopt an academic form of governance. The librarians should form as a library faculty whose role and authority is similar to that of the faculties of a college, or the faculty of a school or a department.[17]

No doubt approval of this document will give still further impetus to the movement toward academic governance. Many library staffs are in the process of drawing up tentative by-laws or constitutions for the library faculty. They range from universities as diverse as the University of Minnesota, Northern Illinois University, New York University, University of Pittsburgh, and the California State Colleges. Some universities already have such by-laws, a notable example being Southern Illinois at Edwardsville. Some believe that under a form of academic governance the role of the chief librarian will undergo a decided change. He may become a dean, as at New York University, appointed by the President and presiding over a faculty, and thus primarily an administrative official. Or he may merely be a department head, whether appointed by the college administration, as at the City University of New York, or possibly elected and confirmed by the professional staff as appears to take place at SIU at Edwardsville. Some librarians in the City University of New York are now urging the election of the chief librarian as occurs in other academic departments of the university. Unless chief librarians become deans instead of department heads, that would, of course, be a natural development from academic governance.

With faculty governance the normal academic procedures come into play: faculty committees on promotion, tenure, grievances, policy decision by the entire faculty or committees of the faculty, more formal standards for professional development, etc., as well as the normal professional jealousies such committees often encourage.

One puzzling aspect of the trend toward academic governance is that the organizational charts for operations remain much the same. As one individual explained to me, the professional staff makes the policies and the library administration then carries out these policies. How this will work, or if it will work, is not yet clear to me.

Faculty organization, while seemingly a trend, does raise some serious questions among thoughtful librarians. If the professional staff does

organize as a faculty whether departmental or college, what about the clerical staff? If one assumes as a basic principle that staff should participate in decisions which directly affect them, then he can scarcely ignore a group of full-time employees which do the bulk of the work and who constitute anywhere from fifty to seventy percent of the total staff. One director suggested that "they have their union to protect them," and, apparently there are more clerical staffs with union organizations than professional staffs. That kind of attitude would seem to suggest that clerical employees are not interested in policy matters, but are chiefly concerned about their benefits and working conditions. Is this true? Are professional librarians mainly interested in faculty governance for policy matters or for benefits and working conditions?

If the latter should be true, do promotion, tenure, and grievance committees necessarily provide a professional librarian with a more objective evaluation for salaries, benefits, adjustment of his problems, etc., than competent department heads or other administrators? What about the objective evaluation of an individual who may have been passed over several times for promotion? Is he necessarily better off with his peers than with his administrator?

Can a library staff, given both the external and internal pressures exerted upon any large library system, actually determine policies which will be acceptable to the total university community? If one is talking about cataloging and classification, perhaps. If he is talking about collection development or hours of opening, both of which have budgetary and staffing implications, probably not.

Given the budgetary constraints likely to be present during the seventies, will our already hard-pressed staffs be able to find the hours for deliberations and will they take seriously the long hours necessary for finding solutions to difficult policy questions? If one adopts an extensive and powerful committee structure, how shall the committee be constituted? By election? By appointment? Is participatory democracy actually better than representative democracy? Is it possible to organize a large university library system so that everyone invariably is consulted about every major policy issue, and what constitutes a "major" policy issue anyway? Can there be some selection of policies requiring mutual consent? If so, who will do the selection?

A more fundamental question arises from the current attitude of society toward higher education. In an age when tenure, academic organization generally, and the nature of the university are all under serious attack as being unresponsive, do librarians need to look at the way faculties are organized, do they need to look to others for models, or do they need to seek some other form of organization more far-reaching than anything which now exists? Some critics believe that the most inefficient, ineffective ways of organizing anything are the traditional procedures of academic departments and colleges. If they

should be right, little is to be gained by the adoption of such outmoded forms.

A few universities are not convinced that faculty governance by itself is an adequate model to follow. For three years UCLA has been working with two management consultants to study their organizational patterns and to make recommendations that would relate to recent management theory.[18] Out of this soul-searching of the entire staff has emerged a pattern which strengthens some of the decentralized units while still attempting to maintain communications across disciplinary lines. Assistant librarians at UCLA have become not line officers in the traditional sense but rather coordinators whose primary responsibility is to encourage individual library units to adopt policies which will serve the entire system as well as their own units. A series of five random groups, selected from the twenty-six unit heads, meet either weekly or bi-weekly for discussion. Since their chairmen sit with the Advisory Council they are assured that staff input does reach the chief librarian. In addition there are seven staff resource committees with liberal representation of professional and clerical employees, which advise top administrators on any topic within their sphere of functional responsibility. An obvious aim of the UCLA program is maximum involvement of all 500 staff members and the development of a team approach to problem solving. The system is non-hierarchical in structure and committee membership rotates every six months to assure maximum involvement.

Whether or not anything comes of this experiment, it is surely unique among American university libraries in approach and design. An evaluation of the program is now underway and should be available by the end of the year.

Another university which has chosen a route different from the faculty governance pattern is Columbia. As a result of the ARL Pilot Project there has been extensive staff involvement in the study. For instance, some 80 people serve on various committees looking at long-range goals for the Columbia University Libraries. Seemingly Columbia is not troubled by faculty status since Columbia librarians have a carefully defined academic status in their own statutes. The staff is studying itself along with the management team, so there is ample room for interaction among various groups.

At the present time the BAH study group is concluding its study of the major executive positions in the Columbia University Libraries, evaluating their roles and functions, and looking at possible alternatives. Initially the consultant team viewed the executive structure of Columbia as comprised of five essential positions in addition to the director of libraries. These included associate directors for user services and technical services, plus assistant directors for management service and personnel, and one assistant to the director for planning. The consultants

are also prepared to recommend a professional development program that would utilize some aspects of peer evaluation, but a continuation of the primary administration functions of position performance review and salary decision. Columbia would appear to want the best of both worlds. Both the UCLA and Columbia projects will be watched with great interest by those of us concerned with library organization.

Unionization came first to libraries in the form of clerical staffs. Now a goodly number of professional staffs are organizing, with the pattern not yet clear on how far this may go. Under provisions of the Taylor law in New York state, all state employees must belong to some bargaining agent. For the City University of New York, since academic librarians are defined in the by-laws as faculty, this means participation with the faculty in the Legislative Conference, a bargaining agent which negotiates a three-year contract spelling out in detail the rights and privileges of all faculty members. There are also contracts for other staff members, including both full-time and part-time clerical employees. This pattern is now a possibility in Michigan as a result of recent legislation and the Wayne State University librarians were discussing a prospective vote on union representation during the spring. The University of Chicago had a considerable union organizing activity last winter, but the National Labor Relations Board ruled that supervisory personnel could not promote the unionization of the staff. Since department heads were behind the movement, the matter has therefore been dropped for the present. Future decisions on this point await further clarification, but the recent case at Fordham would indicate that additional battles are yet to be waged. Clerical employees at both Columbia and New York University belong to unions but the professional staffs do not. One can look upon this as desirable or not desirable, but ultimately the unionization of all staffs would undoubtedly change some of the ways in which libraries can be organized and administered.[20]

This review of what seems to me to be emerging trends in library organization is, of course, oversimplified. Each institution has its own peculiarities and problems; most have some variation of the basic patterns described. Yet there are similarities. Whether through faculty governance, greater staff involvement through committees or other structures, or through unionization, the stress is upon staff involvement in library decisions. Except for one or two universities, most librarians gave their chiefs good marks for encouraging greater participation in management and for their willingness to experiment with new forms.

Objectively, it is difficult to see that much of this ferment actually results in radical re-organization of library management. The only really different pattern is that at UCLA. Interestingly enough, the new Rogers and Weber book, *University Library Administration*,[21] is a fairly traditional approach to university library organization as it exists. One wonders why no one has taken a new look at Harvard's coordinated

decentralization where each school and college library becomes the responsibility of its school or college?[22] Why has there been no attempt to apply the principle of decentralization to large universities and their libraries, breaking them down into smaller units and possibly more manageable units? Except for law and medicine, and not always there, we have maintained the principle of centralization of control. No doubt this has been a cardinal principle primarily for reasons of economy and efficiency. But what about decentralization for service? In our questioning society a number of individuals would propound the view that, after a certain size has been reached, some form of decentralization is both necessary and desirable.

Such problems seem almost overwhelming and the tendency to despair would be quite forgiveable. Yet with few exceptions I discovered little breast-beating, few *mea culpas,* and, even in an institution that should have had the greatest concern for its future, a kind of faith in the life of learning that was heart-warming indeed. Though tensions do exist and may even mount, especially with pressure from outside agencies but also from within staffs, there is a remarkable willingness to use one's abilities as a professional in the best sense of that word. Whatever organizational patterns emerge, American university libraries are likely to take them in their stride, adopt the best after careful staff analysis, and then move on to more effective service. Six months ago I might not have said that, or if I had, it might not have had the ring of conviction. After visiting with many dedicated and intelligent librarians in universities from coast to coast, I am optimistic about the future of academic libraries and the academic librarian.

Notes

[1]Theodore Samore, "College and University Library Statistics," in *The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information, 1971.* (New York: R. R. Bowker, 1971), pp. 8-10.

[2]*Ibid.*

[3]See my "Resources for Research in Urban Areas," *Wilson Library Bulletin,* 41 (January 1967), pp. 502-509, as well as Robert T. Grazier, "The Development of the Urban University Library," *Library Trends,* 10 (April, 1962), p. 460.

[4]Booz, Allen and Hamilton, Inc., *Problems in University Library Management; A Study Conducted . . . for the Association of Research Libraries and the American Council on Education.* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 1970), p. 31. Referred to hereafter as BAH, *Problems in University Library Management.*

[5]"College and University Library Statistics," *College and Research Libraries,* 4 (March, 1943), p. 158.

[6]"College and University Library Statistics," *College and Research Libraries,* 11 (April, 1950), [p. 155].

[7]See, for example, Eugene H. Wilson's excellent article, "Government and Control of the College Library," in Herman H. Fussler, ed. *The Function of the Library in the Modern College* (The Nineteenth Annual Conference of the Graduate Library School). (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954), pp. 22-36.

[8]Arthur M. McAnally, "Organization of College and University Libraries," *Library Trends,* 1 (July, 1952), p. 23.

[9]BAH, *Problems in University Library Management,* pp. iii-iv.

[10]"University Library Organization and Patterns to Be Studied at Columbia University Libraries," *CLR Recent Developments* no. 299, for release December 6, 1970.

[11]A good overview of the urban university library can be found in "Urban University Libraries," ed. Lorena A. Garloch, *Library Trends,* 10 (April, 1962). While this issue does need updating, it still contains much useful information.

[12]Fn. 3, *supra.*

[13]BAH, *Problems in University Library Management,* p. 31.

[14]Lawrence A. Allen and Barbara C. Conroy, "Social Interaction Skills," *Library Trends,* 20 (July, 1971), pp. 78-91.

[15]Maurice P. Marchant, "Participative Management as Related to Personnel Development," *Library Trends,* 20 (July, 1971), pp. 48-59.

[16]"Standards for Faculty Status Approved," *College and Research Libraries News,* (September, 1971), [p. 217].

[17]"Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians," *College and Research Libraries News,* (June, 1971), p. 171.

[18]Joanna E. Tallman, "The New Library Management Network at the University of California, Los Angeles," ditto.

[19]"NLRB Reaffirms Its Jurisdiction in Bargaining at Private Colleges," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* 6 (September 27, 1971), pp. 1, 3.

[20]See Rutherford D. Rogers and David C. Weber, *University Library Administration,* (New York: H. W. Wilson, 1971), "Library Unions," pp. 54-57.

[21]*Ibid.,* pp. 61-88.

[22]Douglas W. Bryant, "Centralization and Decentralization at Harvard," *College and Research Libraries,* 22 (September, 1961), pp. 328-334.

APPENDIX A

Schedule

November, 1970 - July, 1971

CLR Trips

November 3, 1970 Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia

November 5, 1970 Georgia Tech, Atlanta

February 5, 1971 University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California

February 5 (evening) Los Angeles Public Library, Los Angeles

February 6, 1971 Pepperdine University, Los Angeles

February 8, 1971 San Fernando Valley State College, Northridge

February 10-11, 1971 University of California at Los Angeles Los Angeles

February 12, 1971 Richard Abel Company, Portland, Oregon

February 22, 1971 State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, New York

February 23, 1971 University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

February 24, 1971 Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia

February 25-27, 1971 Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida (Library History Seminar)

March 11, 1971 Central Headquarters, CUNY, New York City

March 12, 1971 Hunter College, CUNY, New York City

March 15, 1971 City College, CUNY, New York City

March 16, 1971 New York University, Washington Square, New York City

March 17, 1971 Columbia University, New York City

March 18, 1971 H. W. Wilson Company, Bronx, New York

March 19, 1971 Queens College, Flushing, New York

March 31-April 4, 1971 Texas Library Association Conference, Corpus Christi, Texas

April 15, 1971 Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan

April 16, 1971 University Microfilms, Ann Arbor

April 16, 1971 University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

April 19, 1971 University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, Chicago, Illinois

April 20, 1971 Northern Illinois University, DeKalb

April 21, 1971 Illinois Higher Education Board, Chicago

April 21, 1971 John Crerar Library, Chicago

April 22-23, 1971 Universtiy of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota

June 20-26, 1971 American Library Association Conference, Dallas, Texas

June 24-25, 1971 Southern Methodist University, Dallas

June 19, 1971 University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

July 21-22, 1971 University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa

July 23, 1971 Joint University Libraries, Nashville, Tennessee

Non CLR Trips

January 13-15, 1971 University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

May 3-5, 1971 U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

May 9-12, 1971 University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia
Southern Association Visitation

May 13-15, 1971 University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill